

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 1, 7 and 8.

The above amendment is responsive to points set forth in the Official Action.

In this regard, the feature of claim 10 has now been incorporated in claim 1.

The significance of this amendment will become further apparent from the remarks below.

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatakeyama (U.S. 5,750,309 A).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

One of the most significant differences between claim 1 and the Hatakeyama disclosures lies in the ratio of the Mw_{max} to Mw_{min} .

The significance of this feature is discussed e.g. on page 7, second full paragraph of the present specification.

In paragraph 6 of the Official Action, it is contended that this parameter is somehow taught or suggested by the cited reference.

This contention appears to be based on the parameter of "molecular weight dispersity (dispersion)" which is Mw/Mn for a polymer.

This parameter of molecular weight dispersion does not relate to or suggest the parameter presently recited. Namely, the presently claimed parameter which should be smaller than 1.5 of (1.3 after the above amendment) is the ratio of the weight-average molecular weights Mw of the two (or more) polymeric resins constituting the component (A) of the claimed composition.

In this regard, good comparative data on the presently recited parameter can be obtained from TABLE 1 of Hatakeyama which provides detailed numerical values of the weight-average molecular weights Mw for each combination of the high (higher or highest) molecular weight polymer and the low (lower or lowest) molecular weight polymer in Examples E1 to E15.

In E1, for example, the former Mw value is 11000 and the latter Mw value is 5000 giving a ratio of $11000/5000=2.2$ which is not smaller than 1.5 or 1.3

In E6, for another example, the former Mw value is 20000 and the latter Mw value is 5000 giving a ratio of $20000/5000=4.0$, which is much larger than 1.5 or 1.3.

In E13, this ratio is $11000/1000=11$, which is still larger. In none of the Examples E1 to E15, can the ratio be smaller than 1.3.

Thus, no one skilled in the art and informed of the Hatakeyama reference would be motivated to employ a combination of two (or more) kinds of polymeric resins each having a weight-average molecular weight M_w satisfying the requirement for the ratio of the M_w values or appreciate the significance of this ratio.

For the foregoing reasons, it is apparent that the rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn.


No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazufumi SATO et al.

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

By: 
Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/kes
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 5, 2005